



Future D&D and Recycling Subcommittee

Meeting Summary

May 10, 2011 • 4:30 p.m.

The Ohio State University Endeavor Center

1862 Shyville Road, Piketon, OH 45661

Subcommittee Members Present: Martha Cosby, Ervin Craft, Val Francis, Brian Huber, Daniel Moore, Cristy Renner, and Roger Scaggs

SSAB Members Absent: Lindy Coleman and Sharon Manson

Board Members Present: Richard Snyder

DOE Employees and Contractors: Dennis Carr, Bob Nichols, Jennifer Chandler, J.D. Chiou, Julie Loerch, FBP; Pete Mingus, WAI, Kevin Ironside and Rick Greene, RSI

Liaisons: Stephen Wells, Ohio Environmental Protection Agency (Ohio EPA) and Joe Crombie, Ohio Department of Health

Support Staff: Julie Galloway, EHI

Public: Geoffrey Sea, Sargents Historic Preservation Project; Kyle Gumto, OU; Mark Johnson

Renner, Subcommittee Chair, opened the meeting.

1. Building Reuse Lessons Learned From ETTP by Kevin Ironside:

- Comparative Overview
- ETTP Site Map
- Aerial View of ETTP
- ETTP Regional Setting
- Regional Setting Overview
- ETTP Approach
- Post-Cleanout Interior
- Lessons Learned
- PORTS Path Forward

A copy of the above-stated presentation can be viewed on the SSAB website.

2. Discussion:

Question/Comment:	Answer:
Snyder asked when did they decide they did not want to use the K-25 building.	Ironside stated K-25 was always intended to be torn down.
What is left in some of the buildings that are standing?	Some still have process equipment.
Francis asked if DOE turned over the buildings to Oak Ridge's Community Reuse Organization. Are there any security issues with the buildings after they are cleaned up?	Ironside stated no they did not. There should not be any security issues.
Has there been any discussion with any business using the certain buildings at PORTS?	Chandler stated just buildings occupied by USEC

3. Path Forward:

- **Renner** stated the Subcommittee needs to have a working session with the Waste Disposition Subcommittee to develop a recommendation. The working session will be May 24 at 4:30.
- **Carr** stated that the recommendation needs to be very specific on what you want to leave standing. You need a snapshot of an end use such as what utilities stay, what roads need to stay, cap things or dig it up.

4. Public Comment:

Sea stated I am very confused about stage 2 because I was told there is a third option that is not to tear down, it was filling of the process buildings with earth which they were very excited about. SONG has been putting forward alternatives for the site redevelopment since 1996 we are the first ones to propose an Energy Park.

Meeting adjourned